This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 8, 2007. Claims 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, and 36 are presented for examination, of which Claims 27 and 33 are in independent form.

The Office Action states that Claims 27 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Appln. Publication No. 20030054836 (*Michot*); and that Claims 27, 29-30, 33 and 35-36 are rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,864,306 (*Dwyer et al.*). Applicants have carefully studied the prior art and the Office Action, but find themselves unable to agree with the rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Important features of Claim 27 are "creating a project task, associated with a resource, using a user interface, the project task having a predetermined completion time", "computing a task work time representing a time period that the resource was in a work environment, based at least on the first time value and the second time value", "associating the resource identifier and the task work time with the project task in the resource engine" and "comparing the predetermined completion time with the task work time." By virtue of these features, the time a task takes to complete is monitored ("task work time") and associated with a project task. In addition, the task work time is compared with a predetermined completion time corresponding to the project task.

Michot relates to "time-controlling" the movement or position of persons, animals or objects. Apparently, *Michot* teaches using a wireless device to track "elapsed time" (also referred to as "working time") using "signaling messages" containing the same identification code. *Michot*, para. 16.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *See e.g.*, MPEP § 2131 (internal citations omitted). Nothing has been found in *Michot* that is believed to teach, suggest or otherwise result in "<u>creating a project task</u>, associated with a resource, using a user interface, <u>the project task having a predetermined completion time</u>," much less "<u>comparing</u> the predetermined completion time with the task work time," as recited in Claim 27 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 27 is not anticipated by *Michot*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Dwyer et al. relates to a road toll collection system. Apparently, *Dwyer et al.* teaches to determine a vehicle's time of entry into and exit from ("the transaction time") a toll road. As described in *Dwyer et al.*,

> The vehicles are detected when they enter and exit the toll road 19 which provides data indicative of the locations and times of entry into and exit from the toll road 19. The transponder 18 transmits transponder identification data to the roadside toll collectors 11 that is correlated with the vehicle detection data. The identification data, location data, and entry and exit data are processed by the roadside toll collectors 11 to generate transaction reports for each vehicle 17. The toll transaction processor 12 processes the transaction reports to generate tolling transactions for each vehicle 17. The tolling transactions are forwarded to the revenue management system 14 which generates tolls for each vehicle 17 and bills the owner of the transponders 18 for use of the toll road 19.

Dwyer et al., Col. 3, lines 28-44. As with *Michot*, at best *Dwyer et al.* simply teaches a technique for detecting elapsed time.

Nothing has been found in *Dwyer et al.* that is believed to teach, suggest or otherwise result in the "creating a project task" and "comparing" features discussed above with respect to Claim 27.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 27 is not anticipated by *Dwyer et al.*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Independent Claim 33 includes features similar to those discussed above, in which a project task having a predetermined completion time and being associated with a resource is created and the predetermined completion time is compared with the actual task work time. Therefore, claim 33 also is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Should issues remain following a careful consideration of the present amendment, the courtesy of a telephone interview to provide clarification concerning those issues and discuss possible claim language to address the issues is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1529303_1.DOC